	LYNCH
_	USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: DATE FILED: 2/9/08
all :	
:	Civil Action No. 08 Civ. 1273 (4 4
:	STIPULATION AND ORDER
J. :	FCF Case

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MARKO BABIC, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMBAC FINANCIAL GROUP, INC., ROBERT GENADER, PHILLIP B. LASSITER, SEAN T. LEONARD and THOMAS J. GANDOLFO,

Defendants.

STIPULATION AND ORDER ADJOURNING THE TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO ANSWER, MOVE TO DISMISS OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT

IT IS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT Reimer v. Ambac Financial Group, Inc. et al., No. 08 Civ 411 (S.D.N.Y), is a related action that arises from the same set of facts and circumstances that underlie the above-caption action.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned counsel, that plaintiff shall have until 60 days after the entry of an order appointing lead plaintiff and approving lead counsel pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3) to file a consolidated and/or amended complaint, and that the time of all defendants to answer, move to dismiss or otherwise respond to the Complaint shall be extended to 60 days after the filing of such consolidated and/or amended complaint. Plaintiff will have 60 days after defendants file any motion to dismiss to file any response, and defendants will have 45 days thereafter to file any reply.

IT IS FURTHER ACKNOWLEDGED THAT, as 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(3)(B) provides, all discovery, including initial disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a), shall be stayed through the pendency of the motion to dismiss, unless the court finds upon the motion of any

party that particularized discovery is necessary to preserve evidence or to prevent undue prejudice to that party.

DEFENDANTS ACKNOWLEDGE, without waiver of any arguments or defenses, including defenses related to personal jurisdiction, receipt of a copy of the Complaint in this action as of the date the Court "so orders" and enters this Stipulation, and agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the Complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring service of judicial process in the manner provided for by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED THAT nothing herein shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of, and defendants do not waive and expressly preserve, all arguments and defenses in the above-captioned action, including defenses related to personal jurisdiction.

Dated: New York, New York February 13, 2008

LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

By:

Christopher Keller (CK-2347) Andrei V. Rado (AR-3724) Alan I. Ellman (AE-7347)

140 Broadway New York, New York 10005 (212) 907-0700 (212) 818-0477 (facsimile)

FINKELSTEIN THOMPSON LLP

Donald J. Enright Elizabeth K. Tripodi 1050 30th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 337-8000 (202) 337-8090 (facsimile)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ

By:

Peter C. Hein (PH-5279) Warren R. Stern (WS-2957) Joshua A. Naftalis (JN-8054)

51 West 52nd Street New York, New York 10019 (212) 403-1000 (212) 403-2000 (facsimile)

Attorneys for Defendants

SO ORDERED:

United States District Judge

New York, New York Dated: